



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/047,553	10/26/2001	George Lownes	MATP-616US	4175
23122 7590 02/09/2007 RATNERPRESTIA P O BOX 980 VALLEY FORGE, PA 19482-0980			EXAMINER TRAN, HAI V	
			ART UNIT 2623	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS			02/09/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/047,553

Applicant(s)

LOWNES, GEORGE

Examiner

Hai Tran

Art Unit

2623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 August 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 08/18/2006 with respect to claims 1-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dinwiddie et al (US 7124210) in view of Kraml et al. (US 6141683).

Claim 1, Dinwiddie discloses a method of upgrading operational software in a host device having a smart card interface, the host device including a read-only memory having original software for the host device (Fig. 1), comprising the steps of:

Providing a smart card including data representing upgraded software for the host device (Col. 3, lines 3-6);

Interfacing the smart card with the smart card interface of the host device (page 4, lines 19-24 Col. 3, lines 6-7),

Recognizing, in the host device, the smart card as including the upgraded software (page 4, lines 17-19 Col. 3, lines 4-6);

determining if the upgraded software is compatible with the host device by comparing attributes of the upgraded software to that of the host device, the host device performing the determination of compatibility before the upgraded software is transferred from the smart card (page 5, lines 22-30+ Col. 3, lines 50-58);

if the upgraded software is determined to be compatible, transferring the upgraded software from the smart card to a memory of the host device to perform the code upgrade (page 5, lines 2-5 and lines 25-28 Col. 3, lines 59-61); and

verifying the software transferred to the memory using data stored on the smart card (page 5, lines 25-30+ Col. 3, lines 61-63)

Dinwiddie does not clearly disclose, "if the transferred software can not be verified, restoring the original software from the read-only memory."

Kraml discloses a process of updating software that if the transferred software cannot be verified, restoring the original software from the read-only memory (see Col. 7, lines 25-43). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Dinwiddie in view of Kraml so to maintain reliability of the system to roll back to previous version while reducing any disruption in the provisioning of service and is inexpensive. (Col. 2, lines 5-37).

Claim 2, Dinwiddie further discloses a method according to claim 1, wherein the step of recognizing the smart card as including the upgraded software includes the steps of:

Art Unit: 2623

accessing a card information structure (CIS) of the smart card (Col. 3, lines 27-49); and

comparing the CIS to predetermined parameters, which identify the smart card as a software upgrade smart card (Col. 3, lines 3-5; lines 50-57).

Claim 3, Dinwiddie further discloses, wherein the smart card includes (National Renewable Security Standard) NRSS conditional access protocols and the step of recognizing the smart card as including the upgraded software includes accessing application information specified by the NRSS (page 5, lines 22-30+ Col. 3, lines 50-57).

2. Claims 4-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dinwiddie et al (US 7124210) in view of Kraml et al. (US 6141683) and further in view of Metz et al. (US 5666293) and further in view of Kidder et al (US 2004/0031030).

Claim 4, Dinwiddie in view of Kraml does not clearly disclose, further wherein the host device is an open cable compliant set top box, coupled to a cable head end and includes an out of band channel for transferring data between the host compliant device and the cable head end and the method further includes the step of sending a message to the Cable head end via the out of band channel to indicate that the upgraded software has been transferred to the host compliant device.

In an analogous art, Metz teaches, wherein the host device (100 - figures 1 & 6) is an open cable compliant set top box, coupled to a cable head end (11 - figure 1) and includes an out of band channel for transferring data between the host compliant device and the cable head end (Col. 16, lines 38-62).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Dinwiddie in view of Kraml the teachings of Metz in order for an open cable compliant set-top box to be connected to a cable head end for the benefit of sending and receiving control information from the cable head end.

The combination of Dinwiddie in view of Kraml and Metz fail to disclose sending a message to the cable head end via the out of band channel to indicate that the upgraded software has been transferred to the host compliant device.

In an analogous art, Kidder discloses when an upgrade is completed; the control shim notifies the slave SMSs, which sends a message to the master SMS or "head end" indicating that the upgrade of software is complete (§ 0494).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Dinwiddie in view of Kraml and Metz with the teachings of transmitting a message to the headend indicating the installation of new software is completed, as taught by Kidder, in order to notify the headend of the latest version of software installed on the receiver.

Claim 5, is analyzed with respect to claim 1 and 4.

Claim 6, Metz further discloses the memory is a flash memory (Col. 21, lines 33-37)

Claim 7, Metz further discloses wherein the smartcard conform to PCMCIA (Col. 21, lines 33-37 and 50-53).

Claim 8 is further met by the analysis of claim 1.

3. Claims 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Metz et al. (US 5666293) in view of Dinwiddie et al (US 7124210) and further in view of Kraml et al. (US 6141683).

Claim 9, Metz discloses an open cable compliance STB (see Fig. 6) comprising:

A point of deployment interface (see Fig. 6, el. 155);

A smartcard (PCMCIA card), coupled to the POD interface (see Fig. 6; Col. 22, lines 64-66);

A ROM having original program data for the STB (Col. 21, lines 50-53 and lines 65-Col. 22, lines 5);

A processor 110 coupled to the POD interface 155 (see Fig. 6);

A memory 115/120 coupled to the processor, the memory including operational software that controls the STB ; and

A bootstrap loader which is configured to control the processor to transfer program data from the POD interface to the memory to overwrite the operational software with upgraded software (Col. 22, lines 27-60);

Metz does not clearly disclose determining means which is determines whether the upgraded software is compatible by comparing attributes of the upgraded software to that of the host device and which verifies the program data transferred by the bootstrap loader using data stored on the smartcard and if the transferred program data cannot be verified, restoring the original program data from the read-only memory.

Dinwiddie discloses determining means which is determines whether the upgraded software is compatible by comparing attributes of the upgraded software to that of the host device and which verifies the program data transferred by the bootstrap loader using data stored on the smartcard (page 5, lines 22-30+ Col. 3, lines 50-63). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Metz with Dinwiddie so to take the advantage of the smartcard features that complies with ISO standard 7816-2 and high-speed data ports of an NRSS-type card such that software could be updated through the smartcard interface (Col. 1, lines 54-57).

Metz in view of DinWiddie does not clearly disclose if the transferred program data cannot be verified, restoring the original program data from the read-only memory.

Kraml discloses a process of updating software that if the transferred software cannot be verified, restoring the original software from the read-only memory (see Col. 7, lines 25-43). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Metz in view of Dinwiddie and Kraml so to maintain reliability of the system to roll back to previous version while reducing any disruption in the provisioning of service and is inexpensive (Col. 2, lines 5-37).

Claim 10, Dinwiddie further discloses wherein the smartcard includes CIS data which identifies the smartcard as POD card or software update card (page 4, lines 17-19 Col. 3, lines 4-6);

Claim 11, Metz further discloses wherein the smartcard conforms to PCMCIA (Col. 21, lines 33-37 and 50-53).

Claim 12, Dinwiddie further discloses

The smart card further includes identification data which identifies a host compliant device for which the upgraded software is intended (page 5, lines 22-30+);
and

the memory further includes software that causes the processor to read the identification data from the smart card and to compare the identification data to identification data for the set top box; whereby the processor determines if the

Art Unit: 2623

software update is appropriate for the set-top box (page 5, lines 25-28 Col. 3, lines 59-63);

Claim 13, Metz discloses a method of providing a software upgrade to an open cable compliant host device (STB 100) coupled to a CATV headend (see Fig. 1), the host device (STB 100) include a ROM having original for the host device (Col. 21, lines 50-53 and lines 65-Col. 22, lines 5) comprising:

providing a smart card including the software upgrade for transfer to the host device (Col. 22, 50-53; Col. 12, lines 52-60);

interfacing the smart card with a POD interface of the host device (Col. 22, lines 64-67+);

resetting the host device (Col. 22, lines 64-67+);

reading and processing a card information (bit pattern) of the smart card to identify the smart card as providing the software upgrade;

Metz does not clearly disclose reading and processing a card information structure (CIS) of the smartcard to identify the smartcard as providing the software upgrade; and determining if the software upgrade is compatible with the host device by comparing attributes of the software upgrade to that of the host device, the host device performing the determination of compatibility before the software upgrade is read from the smartcard; if the software upgrade is determined to be compatible, reading the software upgrade of the smartcard and writing the software upgrade to a memory of the compliant host device; and verifying the software written to the

memory using data stored on the smartcard and if the written software cannot be verified, restoring the original software from the ROM memory.

Dinwiddie discloses reading and processing a card information structure (CIS) of the smartcard to identify the smartcard as providing the software upgrade (page 4, lines 17-20); and determining if the software upgrade is compatible with the host device by comparing attributes of the software upgrade to that of the host device (page 4, lines 30-page 5, line 2), the host device performing the determination of compatibility before the software upgrade is read from the smartcard; if the software upgrade is determined to be compatible, reading the software upgrade of the smartcard and writing the software upgrade to a memory of the compliant host device and verifying the software written to the memory using data stored in the smartcard (page 5, lines 20-30+). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Metz with Dinwiddie to update software utilizing a smartcard interface so to avoid of having a technician to visit the consumer's location and perform the upgrade of the software, as suggested by Dinwiddie (page 1, lines 12-15 and lines 23-30).

Metz in view of Dinwiddie does not clearly disclose if the written software cannot be verified, restoring the original software from the ROM memory.

Kraml discloses a process of updating software that if the transferred software cannot be verified, restoring the original software from the read-only memory (see Col. 7, lines 25-43). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Metz in view of Dinwiddie with Kraml so to maintain reliability of the system to roll back to previous version while reducing any disruption in the provisioning of service and is inexpensive (Col. 2, lines 5-37).

4. Claims 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Metz et al. (US 5666293) in view of Dinwiddie et al (US 7124210) and further in view of Kraml et al. (US 6141683) and further in view of Kidder et al (US 2004/0031030).

Claim 14, the combination of Metz in view of Dinwiddie and Kraml fail to disclose determining whether the software upgrade was successful and sending a message to the cable head end when the software upgrade is complete.

In an analogous art, Kidder discloses when an upgrade is completed; the control shim notifies the slave SMSs, which sends a message to the master SMS or "head end" indicating that the upgrade of software is complete (¶ 0494). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Metz in view of Dinwiddie and Kraml with the teachings of transmitting a message to the headend indicating the installation of new software is completed of Kidder in order to notify the headend of the latest version of software installed on the receiver.

Art Unit: 2623

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hai Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-7305. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher S. Kelley can be reached on (571) 272-7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HT:ht
01/25/2007


HAI TRAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER